



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/200,657 11/25/98 HEIN

M TSRI-184.200

THOMAS FITTING
THE SCRIPPS RESEARCH INSTITUTE
10550 NORTH TORREY PINES ROAD
MAIL DROP-TPC-8
LA JOLLA CA 92037

HM22/0526

EXAMINER

HAAS, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1649

DATE MAILED:

05/26/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/200,657

Applicant(s)
Hein et al.

Examiner
Thomas Haas

Group Art Unit
1649



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1 and 21-78 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1 and 21-78 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1649

DETAILED ACTION

This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825 for the reason(s) set forth on the attached Notice To Comply With Requirements For Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequence And/Or Amino Acid Sequence Disclosures.

Applicant is given ONE MONTH, or THIRTY DAYS, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this letter within which to comply with the sequence rules, 37 CFR 1.821 - 1.825. Failure to comply with these requirements will result in ABANDONMENT of the application under 37 CFR 1.821(g). Extensions of time may be obtained by filing a petition accompanied by the extension fee under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no case may an applicant extend the period for reply beyond the SIX MONTH statutory period. Direct the reply to the undersigned. Applicant is requested to return a copy of the attached Notice to Comply with the reply.

Drawings

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Art Unit: 1649

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 21-31 and 39-42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,956,282, filed 29 July 1985) in view of Boss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,816,397).

Claims 21-31 and 39-42 are drawn to plants comprising plant cells containing nucleotide sequences encoding biologically functional multimeric proteins.

Goodman et al. teach the production of plants comprising cells containing nucleotide sequences encoding biologically functional mammalian proteins (see entire document). Goodman et al. suggest that transgenic plants can be used as bioreactors to produce valuable mammalian proteins (column 1). Goodman et al. suggest that multimeric immunoglobulins can be produced through the use of transgenic plants (column 1, lines 21-23).

Goodman et al. do not specifically teach a plant comprised of plant cell containing nucleotide sequences encoding biologically functional multimeric proteins.

Boss et al. teach the production of multimeric immunoglobulins (see entire document) through the use of a recombinant host cell. Boss et al. teach that these immunoglobulins are commercially useful and are valuable (column 5, lines 1-10).

Art Unit: 1649

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to produce the plants comprising plant cells containing nucleotide sequences encoding mammalian peptides, as taught by Goodman et al. and to modify these plants by incorporating the nucleotide sequences encoding multimeric immunoglobulin molecules, as taught by Boss et al. and suggested by Goodman et al. so that these plants could be used as bioreactors, as suggested by Goodman et al. so that a useful and valuable supply of immunoglobulin could be produced. Given the teaching of both Goodman et al. and Boss et al. one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to produce such plants because the resulting immunoglobulins would have both commercial and academic value. Thus, claims 21-31 and 39-42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman et al. in view of Boss et al.

Double Patenting

4. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Art Unit: 1649

5. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of copending Application Nos. 08/642,406 and 09/199,534. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

6. The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1 and 21-78 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 5,639,947. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the transgenic plant and method of making same as defined by claims 1 and 21-78 of the instant application are encompassed by claims 1-11 of U. S. Patent No. 5,639,947. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the particular leader sequence used is optimization of design

Art Unit: 1649

parameters and as such the transgenic plants claims 1, 21-78 are an obvious modification of the transgenic plants of U. S. Patent No. 5,639,947.

Conclusion


8. No claims are allowed.

9. Claims 32-38, and 43-78 are deemed free from the prior art for the reasons cited in application 07/971,951.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Haas whose telephone number is (703) 305-7270. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 7:00 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith, can be reached on (703) 308-3909.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


GARY BENZION
PRIMARY EXAMINER

NOTICE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR PATENT APPLICATIONS CONTAINING NUCLEOTIDE SEQUENCE AND/OR AMINO ACID SEQUENCE DISCLOSURES

The nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosure contained in this application does not comply with the requirements for such a disclosure as set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.821 - 1.825 for the following reason(s):

- ☒ 1. This application clearly fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.821-1.825. Applicant's attention is directed to these regulations, published at 1114 OG 29, May 15, 1990 and at 55 FR 18230, May 1, 1990.
- ☒ 2. This application does not contain, as a separate part of the disclosure on paper copy, a "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(c).
- ☒ 3. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has not been submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☐ 4. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has been submitted. However, the content of the computer readable form does not comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.822 and/or 1.823, as indicated on the attached copy of the marked -up "Raw Sequence Listing."
- ☐ 5. The computer readable form that has been filed with this application has been found to be damaged and/or unreadable as indicated on the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report. A Substitute computer readable form must be submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.825(d).
- ☐ 6. The paper copy of the "Sequence Listing" is not the same as the computer readable form of the "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☐ 7. Other: _____

Applicant Must Provide:

- ☒ An initial or substitute computer readable form (CRF) copy of the "Sequence Listing".
- ☒ An initial or substitute paper copy of the "Sequence Listing", as well as an amendment directing its entry into the specification.
- ☒ A statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d).

For questions regarding compliance to these requirements, please contact:

For Rules Interpretation, call (703) 308-4216
For CRF Submission Help, call (703) 308-4212
For PatentIn software help, call (703) 308-6856

PLEASE RETURN A COPY OF THIS NOTICE WITH YOUR RESPONSE